Reply to Office Action of July 24, 2006

Docket No : 3449-0244P

Page 6

**REMARKS** 

In view of the above amendment, applicants believe the pending application is in

condition for allowance.

Claims 1-10 and 17-22 are now present in this application. Claims 1, 17 and 18 are

independent.

Amendments have been made to the Title, claims 11-16 have been canceled, claims 20-

22 have been added, and claims 17-19 have been amended. Reconsideration of this application,

as amended, is respectfully requested.

Priority Under 35 U.S.C. § 119

Applicants thank the Examiner for acknowledging Applicants' claim for foreign priority

under 35 U.S.C. § 119, and receipt of the certified priority document.

**Information Disclosure Citation** 

Applicants thank the Examiner for considering the references supplied with the

Information Disclosure Statements filed on February 15, 2005 and September 27, 2005, and for

providing Applicants with initialed copies of the PTO-1449 or PTO-SB08 forms filed therewith.

**Drawings** 

Applicants thank the Examiner for accepting the drawings.

**Restriction Requirement** 

The Examiner has made the Restriction Requirement final, and has withdrawn claims 11-14

from further consideration. By this Amendment, Applicants have canceled non-elected claims 11-

14. Applicants reserve the right to file a divisional application directed to claims 11-14 at a later date

if so desired.

Birch, Stewart, Kolasch & Birch, LLP

Reply to Office Action of July 24, 2006

Docket No : 3449-0244P

Page 7

**Specification Objection** 

The Examiner has objected to the specification, stating that the title is non-descriptive.

Applicants have amended the Title of the Invention to be more descriptive. Support can be found

on page 1, paragraph of the specification. Reconsideration and withdrawal of this objection are

respectfully requested.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 15 and 16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Hulsebosch et al. in view of Barzegar et al. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

A complete discussion of the Examiner's rejection is set forth in the Office Action, and is

not being repeated here.

While not conceding the appropriateness of the Examiner's rejection, but merely to advance

prosecution of the instant application, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 15-16 have been

cancelled, thus rendering this rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103 moot. Accordingly, reconsideration

and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

Allowable Subject Matter

The Examiner states that claims 1-10 are allowed and that claims 17-19 would be allowable

if rewritten in independent form.

Applicants thank the Examiner for the early indication of allowable subject matter in this

application. As set forth above, claims 17 and 18 have been rewritten in independent form, and

should therefore be in condition for allowance. Also, claim 19 depends, either directly or indirectly,

from independent claim 18, and is therefore allowable based on its dependence from claim 18 which

is believed to be allowable.

**Claims 20-22** 

Claims 20-22 have been added for the Examiner's consideration. Applicants submit that

claims 20-22 depend, either directly or indirectly, from independent claims 17 and 18, and are

Birch, Stewart, Kolasch & Birch, LLP

Application No. 10/600,526

Amendment dated October 24, 2006

Reply to Office Action of July 24, 2006

therefore allowable based on their dependence from claims 17 and 18 which are believed to be

allowable.

In addition, claims 20-22 recite further limitations which are not disclosed or made obvious

Docket No.: 3449-0244P

Page 8

by the applied prior art references.

**Additional Cited References** 

Since the remaining references cited by the Examiner have not been utilized to reject the

claims, but have merely been cited to show the state of the art, no comment need be made with

respect thereto.

Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or

rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently

outstanding rejections and that they be withdrawn. It is believed that a full and complete response

has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition

for allowance.

If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite

prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone James T. Eller, Jr., Registration

No. 39,538, at (703) 205-8000, in the Washington, D.C. area.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment is respectfully requested.

Birch, Stewart, Kolasch & Birch, LLP

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: October 24, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

James T. Eller, Jr.

Registration No.: 39,538

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

Docket No: 3449-0244P

Page 9

8110 Gatehouse Road

Suite 100 East P.O. Box 747

Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747

(703) 205-8000

Attorney for Applicant